arXiv:1602.08835v1 [quant-ph] 29 Feb 2016

Entanglement assisted classical communication simulates "classical communication" without causal order

Seiseki Akibue,[1] Masaki Owari,[2,3] Go Kato,[3] and Mio Murao[4,5]

[1] *Department of Physics Graduate School of Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan*
[2] *College of Global-Interdisciplinary Studies, Academic Institute, Shizuoka University, Hamamatsu, Japan*
[3] *NTT Communication Science Laboratories, NTT Corporation, Kanagawa, Japan*
[4] *Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan*
[5] *Institute for Nano Quantum Information Electronics, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan*

(Dated: March 1, 2016)

Phenomena induced by the existence of entanglement, such as nonlocal correlations, exhibit characteristic properties of quantum mechanics distinguishing from classical theories. When entanglement is accompanied by classical communication, it enhances the power of quantum operations jointly performed by two spatially separated parties. Such a power has been analyzed by the gap between the performances of joint quantum operations implementable by local operations at each party connected by classical communication with and without the assistance of entanglement. In this work, we present a new formulation for joint quantum operations connected by classical communication beyond special relativistic causal order but without entanglement and still within quantum mechanics. Using the formulation, we show that entanglement assisting classical communication necessary for implementing a class of joint quantum operations called separable maps can be interpreted to simulate "classical communication" not respecting causal order. Our results reveal a new counter-intuitive aspect of entanglement related to spacetime.

INTRODUCTION

Quantum mechanics exhibits many counter-intuitive phenomena that cannot be described by classical physics. One such phenomenon is the existence of the *nonlocal correlations* formulated by Bell and CHSH [1]. They have shown that a quantum mechanical state called an *entangled state* shared between two spatially separated parties can produce strong correlations that can never be achieved under any laws of physics based on local realism, e.g. classical mechanics. That is, entanglement has the power to enhance correlation in space. However, entanglement cannot be used for superluminal communication between two parties. Indeed, Popescu and Rohrlich [2] have shown that the nonlocal correlations in quantum mechanics are strictly weaker than correlations imposed by the no-signaling condition based on the law of causality of special relativity. For communication, two parties have to be within a distance across which light can travel, namely, *timelike* separated in both quantum and classical cases.

The power of entanglement in relation to time also arises when it is accompanied by classical communication. Quantum teleportation [3] is one example. Quantum teleportation is a protocol for transmitting quantum information represented by an arbitrary and unknown quantum state from a party (sender) to another timelike separated party (receiver) by using shared entanglement and classical communication from the sender to the receiver. As for transmitting quantum information, quantum teleportation achieves the same goal, namely the direct quantum communication of quantum information, for example, directly sending photon encoding quantum information through an optical fiber. But there is an interesting extra property concerning the time-line of events in quantum teleportation. Quantum communication between two parties (or quantum communication from a mediating third party to two parties) is necessary in quantum teleportation for a fixed entangled state between the sender and to be shared, but this event can be accomplished before the event where the sender decides what quantum information to send. The time-limit of the event of the decision is determined by the timing of classical communication. In contrast in direct quantum communication, the event of the decision should be before the event of quantum communication. Thus we can slightly "dodge" the time-line of the event of quantum communication when entanglement and classical communication are used for transmitting quantum information.

In this article, we investigate a power of entanglement accompanied by classical communication by developing a framework that analyzes the joint quantum operations of two parties implemented by connecting each party's quantum operation well localized in a spacetime coordinate. In general, two local operations at timelike separated spacetime coordinates can be connected by direct quantum communication linking the output and input of the two operations. This direct quantum communication can be replaced by quantum teleportation using entanglement assisted classical communication to separate quantum and classical means. We regard each local operation at a spacetime coordinate belonging to one of the two parties. That is, some of the entanglement is shared between different parties and some of the entanglement is shared within each party. We show that quantum mechanics exhibits a new counter-intuitive phenomenon concerning the spacetime, namely the effect of entanglement shared between the parties assisting classical

communication that simulates "*classical communication*" without predefined causal order between the parties.

We define "classical communication" without causal order by extending the formulation of a special class of deterministic joint quantum operations implementable without entanglement between the parties called *local operations and classical communication* (LOCC) [4–7], which is widely used in the field of quantum information for investigating entanglement and nonlocal properties. In LOCC, local operations belonging to different parties can be connected only by classical communication between timelike separated spacetime coordinates. The ordering of the spacetime coordinates induced by a sequence of timelike connections introduces a total order of local operations. However, it has recently been shown that there is a possibility of performing joint quantum operations without fixing even the partial order of local operations [8–10] in the framework of quantum mechanics. The partial order of the spacetime coordinates following special relativity are referred to as *causal order* in [8–10]. Since the existence of the causal order of local operations in spacetime may not be a fundamental requirement of nature, alternative representations of communication have been proposed that are not based on predefined causal order [8, 11].

We extend LOCC in such a way that we include joint quantum operations between two parties implemented without shared entanglement but with local operations connected by "classical communication" without predefined causal order denoted by CC*. We name a new class of deterministic joint quantum operations obtained by this extension but still within quantum mechanics as LOCC*. We show that LOCC* with CC* respecting causal order is reduced to LOCC. Furthermore, we show that LOCC* can be represented by the ∞-shaped loop in Fig.1 (c) and is equivalent to a certain class of deterministic joint quantum operations known as *separable maps* denoted by SEP [12, 13], which has been introduced for mathematical simplicity to analyze nonlocal quantum tasks in place of LOCC. By considering the correspondence between LOCC* and a probabilistic version of LOCC called stochastic LOCC (SLOCC), we analyze the power of CC* in terms of enhancing the success probability of probabilistic operations in SLOCC. We also investigate the relationship between LOCC* and the quantum process formalism for joint quantum operations without causal order developed in [8].

Since there are elements in SEP that are *not* implementable by LOCC [13–16], shared entanglement is necessary to implement operations in SEP but not included in LOCC with local operations and (normal) classical communication *respecting* causal order. A special class of CC* not respecting any causal order, "classical communication" (truly) without causal order, is necessary to implement an element in SEP that are not in LOCC without the help of entanglement. On the other hand, operations in SEP cannot create entanglement between two parties sharing no entanglement as with LOCC. Recently, the gap between SEP and LOCC has been shown even when infinitely many rounds of classical communications are allowed [7], implying that entanglement plays a somewhat essential role in separating SEP from LOCC. Our result presents an answer as regards this role involving the properties of the spacetime in quantum mechanics.

RESULTS

LOCC*

To introduce LOCC*, we first review the formulation of quantum operations and LOCC. In this article, we consider only finite dimensional quantum systems. A quantum operation is the most general map transforming an input to an output. We can consider both quantum states and classical bits as either the input or output of a quantum operation. The most general quantum operation describes a probabilistic situation where a transformation depending on a classical input is applied to an arbitrary quantum state and then a classical output and a quantum output are probabilistically obtained. The probabilistic transformation can be interpreted as a quantum measurement, and the classical output corresponds to the outcome of the measurement. A deterministic quantum operation can be understood as a special case of a general quantum operation, which only takes the quantum output. We can obtain a deterministic quantum operation from a probabilistic quantum operation by averaging over all possible probabilistic transformations with a weight determined by the probability of the classical output. This averaging process can be considered as discarding information regarding the classical output.

Mathematically, a general quantum operation can be represented by a *quantum instrument* conditioned by a classical input i, which is described by a set of linear maps $\{\mathcal{M}_{o|i}\}_o$ that transforms a quantum input state ρ to a quantum output state given by $\mathcal{M}_{o|i}(\rho)/p(o|i)$ associated with a classical output o ($o = 1, 2, \cdots, n$) with a conditional probability distribution $p(o|i) = \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{M}_{o|i}(\rho)]$. Each element of the instrument $\mathcal{M}_{o|i}$ has to be a *completely positive* (CP) map to describe quantum operations allowed in quantum mechanics. The CP property of the map is required to enable a quantum operation to be performed only on a subsystem of a composite system while keeping the total state of the composite system a valid quantum state. A quantum operation without classical input is denoted by $\{\mathcal{M}_o\}_o$ and a quantum operation without classical output is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{|i}$. For deterministic quantum operations, the sum of elements $\sum_o \mathcal{M}_{o|i}$ has to be a *trace preserving* (TP) map, that is the probability of obtaining the quantum output



FIG. 1. **Joint quantum operations of two parties, Alice and Bob, consisting of local operations**. Dotted arrows represent classical communication between local operations and solid arrows represent quantum communications between local operations. A box represents a local operation. (**a**) Probabilistic operations have a classical output corresponding to the outcome of the measurement. Deterministic operations do not provide a classical output. (**b**) An LOCC protocol, where local operations are totally ordered. Local operations belonging to different parties are connected only by classical communication, whereas local operations within each party are connected by quantum communication. (**c**) A deterministic joint quantum operation consisting of local operations connected by the ∞-shaped loop. Any element of LOCC* can be represented by this joint quantum operation and vice versa as shown in Results.

of the averaged map is given by $\mathrm{tr}\left[\sum_o \mathcal{M}_{o|i}(\rho)\right] = \mathrm{tr}\left[\rho\right] = 1$. Graphical representations of quantum operations are given in Fig.1(**a**).

We consider a deterministic joint quantum operation (a CPTP map) taking only the quantum input and output denoted by $\mathcal{M}$ implemented by two parties, Alice and Bob, who are connected only by classical communication. We set Alice to perform the first operation. As the simplest case, we consider linking a classical output o of Alice's local operation represented by $\{\mathcal{A}_o\}_o$ and a classical input i of Bob's local operation represented by $\mathcal{B}_{|i}$. Since Alice and Bob are acting on different quantum systems at different spacetime coordinates, the joint quantum operation is described by a tensor product of two local operations. The classical communication ability indicates that the spacetime coordinate of Alice's local operation and that of Bob's local operation are timelike separated, and Bob's coordinate is in the future cone of Alice's coordinate. Linking the classical output of Alice o and the classical input of Bob i means that they are perfectly correlated, namely $i = o$ for all o. By taking averages over o and i, we obtain a deterministic joint quantum operation given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{o,i} \delta_{i,o} \mathcal{A}_o \otimes \mathcal{B}_{|i} = \sum_o \mathcal{A}_o \otimes \mathcal{B}_{|o}, \tag{1}$$

where $\delta_{o,i}$ denotes the Kronecker delta. This is the simplest case of LOCC, which is called one-way LOCC.

A deterministic joint operation represented by more general finite-round LOCC between two parties is defined by connecting a sequence of Alice's local operations given by $\{\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1}\}_{o_N,\cdots,o_1}$ and a sequence of Bob's local operations given by $\{\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|i'_N} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{o'_1|i'_1}\}_{o'_N,\cdots,o'_1}$. Here $\circ$ denotes a connection between two local operations at timelike separated coordinates linking the quantum output of a local operation and the quantum input of the next local operation of the *same* party and introduces a total order for each party's local operations. The indices i_k and i'_k are classical inputs of the k-th operations and o_k and o'_k are classical outputs of the k-th operations of Alice and Bob, respectively. In LOCC, the local operations within the parties are totally ordered, and the spacetime coordinates of all the local operations of Alice and Bob are totally ordered alternately. Then o_1 of Alice's local operation and i'_1 of Bob's local operation are linked by classical communication and setting $i'_1 = o_1$, and similarly, o'_1 of Bob's local operation and i_2 of Alice's local operation are linked by setting $i_2 = o'_1$ and so on. Thus, finite-round LOCC between

the two parties is defined by a set of joint quantum operations represented by

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i'_N,o_1,\cdots,o'_N} \delta_{o_N,i'_N}\cdots\delta_{o_1,i'_1}\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|i'_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{o'_1|i'_1} \tag{2}$$

$$= \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_N,o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_N} \mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|o_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{i_2|o_1} \tag{3}$$

where we define $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1} := \sum_{i_1}\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}$. An example for $N = 3$ is shown in Fig.1 (**b**).

Now we develop a framework to investigate local operations and classical communication between the parties without the assumption of the existence of the predefined ordering of the spacetime coordinates. That is, we keep the local spacetime coordinates and the totally ordered structure of the local operations within each party but we do not assign the *global* spacetime coordinate across the parties. Moreover, we allow the connection of any classical inputs and outputs of local operations between different parties as long as the resulting deterministic joint quantum operation falls within the scope of quantum mechanics. This relaxation allows the generalization of classical communication to a conditional probability distribution $p(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N)$ linking the classical outputs and classical inputs of local operations. The corresponding joint quantum operation is represented by

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i'_N,o_1,\cdots,o'_N} p(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N)\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|i'_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{o'_1|i'_1}. \tag{4}$$

This generalization does not guarantee that the joint quantum operation represented by Eq. (4) is TP whereas its CP property is preserved. Since we are investigating deterministic joint quantum operations, we require $p(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N)$ to keep the form of Eq. (4) to represent a CPTP map. We refer to a set of CPTP maps in the form of Eq. (4) with $p(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N)$ as LOCC*.

For one-way LOCC, such a generalization corresponds to replacing the delta function $\delta_{o,i}$ in Eq. (1) with a conditional probability distribution $p(i|o)$. This is equivalent to replacing a perfect classical channel with a general noisy classical channel. However, this is not the case for multiple-round LOCC. A deterministic joint quantum operation is LOCC if and only if it can be decomposed in the form of Eq. (4) with $p(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N)$ respecting the *causal order* of the classical inputs and outputs of local operations imposed by special relativity, namely, the causal order determined by the partial order structure of the spacetime where local operations are performed. We describe the relationship between LOCC and the causal order in Methods. Rigorous definitions and the proof are given in Supplementary Method.

It is easy to check that without loss of generality, any CPTP map in LOCC* can be implemented by just one local operation performed by each party connected by a conditional probability distribution, since by letting $o_A := (o_1,\cdots,o_N)$, $i_A := (i_1,\cdots,i_N)$, $o_B := (o'_1,\cdots,o'_N)$ and $i_B := (i'_1,\cdots,i'_N)$, we can regard the sequence of Alice's local operations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}\}_{o_N,\cdots,o_1}$ as one quantum instrument $\{\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\}_{o_A}$ conditioned by the classical input i_A, as with Bob's local operations and $p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)$ is still a conditional probability distribution. Thus LOCC* is simply defined by a set of deterministic joint quantum operations (= CPTP maps) $\mathcal{M}$ given in the form of

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\otimes\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}, \tag{5}$$

where $p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)$ is a conditional probability distribution satisfying

$$p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)\geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i_A,i_B} p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B) = 1, \tag{6}$$

where $\{\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\}_{o_A}$ is Alice's local operation with a classical input i_A and a classical output o_A, and $\{\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}\}_{o_B}$ is Bob's local operation with a classical input i_B and a classical output o_B . We refer to $p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)$ in Eq. (5) linking the classical outputs and classical inputs as CC*, namely *"classical communication" without predefined causal order*, with respect to local operations $\{\{\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\}_{o_A},\{\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}\}_{o_B}\}$. Note that we can also "collapse" the sequential local operations in multi-round LOCC to represent a joint quantum operation in the form of Eq. (5). However, in this case if we regard the combined operations $\{\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\}_{o_A}$ and $\{\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}\}_{o_B}$ as operations localized in the spacetime of LOCC, the corresponding $p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)$ cannot be interpreted as classical communication respecting causal order.

Further, we show that LOCC* can always be represented by a ∞-shaped loop as shown in Fig.1 (**c**). It is easy to see that if $p(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B) = \delta_{i_A,o_B}\delta_{i_B,o_A}$, LOCC* defined by Eq. (5) reduces to

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{a,b}\mathcal{A}_{a|b}\otimes\mathcal{B}_{b|a}. \tag{7}$$

i) $K^{(A)}_{a|b}$:

a \ b	1	2	3
1	$\|1\rangle_{A'}\langle 0\|_A$	$\|2\rangle_{A'}\langle 0\|_A$	$\|3\rangle_{A'}\langle 0+1\|_A$
2	$\|8\rangle_{A'}\langle 1-2\|_A$	$\|9\rangle_{A'}\langle 1\|_A$	$\|4\rangle_{A'}\langle 0-1\|_A$
3	$\|7\rangle_{A'}\langle 1+2\|_A$	$\|6\rangle_{A'}\langle 2\|_A$	$\|5\rangle_{A'}\langle 2\|_A$

ii)$K^{(B)}_{b|a}$:

a \ b	1	2	3
1	$\|1\rangle_{B'}\langle 0+1\|_B$	$\|2\rangle_{B'}\langle 0-1\|_B$	$\|3\rangle_{B'}\langle 2\|_B$
2	$\|8\rangle_{B'}\langle 0\|_B$	$\|9\rangle_{B'}\langle 1\|_B$	$\|4\rangle_{B'}\langle 2\|_B$
3	$\|7\rangle_{B'}\langle 0\|_B$	$\|6\rangle_{B'}\langle 1-2\|_B$	$\|5\rangle_{B'}\langle 1+2\|_B$

TABLE I. Tables of the Kraus operators $K^{(A)}_{a|b}$ of Alice's local operations $\{\mathcal{A}_{a|b}\}_a$ in i) and $K^{(B)}_{b|a}$ of Bob's local operation $\{\mathcal{B}_{b|a}\}_b$ in ii). In the Kraus operator representation, the deterministic joint quantum operation $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{a,b} \mathcal{A}_{a|b} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{b|a}$ transforms any quantum input ρ_{AB} on systems A and B into a quantum output on systems A' and B' as $\rho'_{A'B'} = \mathcal{M}(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_{a,b} K^{(A)}_{a|b} \otimes K^{(B)}_{b|a} \rho_{AB} (K^{(A)}_{a|b} \otimes K^{(B)}_{b|a})^\dagger$ where $\sum_a (K^{(A)}_{a|b})^\dagger K^{(A)}_{a|b} = \mathbb{I}_A$ for any b and $\sum_b (K^{(B)}_{b|a})^\dagger K^{(B)}_{b|a} = \mathbb{I}_B$ for a with identity operators $\mathbb{I}_A$ and $\mathbb{I}_B$ on system A and B, respectively.

In Methods, we show the converse, namely that all elements of LOCC* can be decomposed into this form, is also true. From this form of LOCC*, it is possible to interpret that CC* in LOCC* can be *looped*, namely, Alice's classical input is Bob's classical output and Bob's classical input is Alice's classical output.

LOCC* and SEP

We show that LOCC* provides an operational interpretation of a set of deterministic joint quantum operations corresponding to SEP by proving that LOCC* is equivalent to SEP. We start by investigating inclusion relations between LOCC and LOCC*. It is easy to verify that LOCC is a subset of LOCC* from the definition of LOCC*. We show that LOCC* is strictly larger than LOCC by constructing the following example based on nine-state discrimination [13].

Example: [13] considers the task of distinguishing a set of nine mutually orthogonal product states of two three-level systems shared between Alice and Bob given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{1(2)}\rangle_{AB} &= |0\rangle_A |0 \pm 1\rangle_B, \qquad |\psi_{3(4)}\rangle_{AB} = |0 \pm 1\rangle_A |2\rangle_B \\ |\psi_{5(6)}\rangle_{AB} &= |2\rangle_A |1 \pm 2\rangle_B, \qquad |\psi_{7(8)}\rangle_{AB} = |1 \pm 2\rangle_A |0\rangle_B, \qquad |\psi_9\rangle_{AB} = |1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^2\}$ is the computational basis of a three-level system, $|a \pm b\rangle := (|a\rangle \pm |b\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, indices A and B represent Alice's share and Bob's share of the states, respectively, by using LOCC. They have shown that a state guaranteed to be one of the set of nine states is *not* deterministically and perfectly distinguishable from other states by any protocol described by a map in LOCC followed by local measurements. We show that the the nine-state *can* be deterministically and perfectly distinguishable by using a map in LOCC* followed by local measurements by presenting constructions of Alice's local operation $\{\mathcal{A}_{a|b}\}_a$ and Bob's local operation $\{\mathcal{B}_{b|a}\}_b$ in the form of Eq. (7). The constructions of $\{\mathcal{A}_{a|b}\}_a$ and $\{\mathcal{B}_{b|a}\}_b$ in Kraus operator representations are given in Table I i) and ii), respectively. It is easy to check that for any $|\psi_k\rangle \in \{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^9$, the corresponding $\mathcal{M}$ in LOCC* with the constructions of the local operations transforms

$$|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| \to \sum_{a,b} \mathcal{A}_{a|b} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{b|a}(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|) = |k\rangle_{A'}\langle k| \otimes |k\rangle_{B'}\langle k| \tag{9}$$

where indices A' and B' denote nine-dimensional output systems for Alice and Bob. Once Alice and Bob obtain the output state $|k\rangle_{A'}\langle k| \otimes |k\rangle_{B'}\langle k|$, they can determine the classical output k by individually performing projective measurements in the basis given by $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^9$. Note that the nine states can be probabilistically distinguished without error by a stochastic LOCC (SLOCC) protocol, which indicates that LOCC* is closely related to SLOCC as shown later.

We can further show that LOCC* is equivalent to a well known class of CPTP maps called *separable operations* (SEP) as summarized in Fig. 2. SEP is a set of maps representing deterministic joint quantum operations $\mathcal{M}$ that



FIG. 2. The inclusion relation between the classes of deterministic joint quantum operations CPTP, SEP, LOCC*, and LOCC. LOCC* is equivalent to the set of separable maps (SEP). LOCC is strictly smaller than SEP. LOCC* is strictly smaller than the set of CPTP.

can be written as

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_k \mathcal{E}_k^A \otimes \mathcal{E}_k^B, \tag{10}$$

where all the elements of Alice and Bob's local operations without classical inputs denoted by $\{\mathcal{E}_k^A\}$ and $\{\mathcal{E}_k^B\}$, respectively, are completely positive. The set of nine states can be deterministically and perfectly distinguished by using a map in SEP whose Kraus operator representation is given by $\{|k\rangle_{A'} \otimes |k\rangle_{B'} \langle\psi_k|_{AB}\}$ followed by local projective measurements in the basis given by $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^9$. By definition, a map in SEP cannot transform any separable states into entangled states [4, 5]. Therefore, SEP does not have the power to create entanglement between two parties if the quantum input is not entangled. The class SEP includes the class LOCC [7]. Due to the mathematical simplicity of its structure, the class SEP is often used for proving that a quantum task is not implementable by LOCC protocols by showing that the task is not implementable even by using a stronger class of operations, SEP. However, its operational meaning has not been clear.

It is easy to see that LOCC* is a subset of SEP from the form of Eq. (5), since $\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}$ are also completely positive and $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ is not negative, so we can always transform a map in LOCC* into the form of (10). To prove that SEP is a subset of LOCC*, we use the fact that an element of SEP is implementable by SLOCC with a *constant* success probability [7]. In Methods, we show that it is possible to reduce the failure probability to zero in a LOCC* protocol and there is always a map in LOCC* corresponding to a map in SEP. Note that the LOCC* map obtained in Methods is different from the simpler LOCC* map given in Table I for nine-state discrimination.

Since any deterministic joint quantum operations can be implemented by entanglement assisted LOCC, LOCC* can be implemented by entanglement assisted (standard) classical communication respecting causal order. Combining the results shown in this part, we see that an operational interpretation of SEP in terms of CC* is given. This interpretation suggests that for implementing maps in SEP but not in LOCC, entanglement assisted classical communication simulates a special class of CC* not respecting causal order, namely, *"classical communication" without causal order*.

Beyond SEP

In this part, we present the relationship between LOCC* and SLOCC. SLOCC is a set of (linear) CP maps consisting of local operations and standard classical communication . In contrast to LOCC, SLOCC contains CP maps representing cases where particular measurement outcomes are post-selected. Since we use a linear map to represent SLOCC, a SLOCC element is not TP but trace decreasing (TD) in general. We define a class of linear CP maps called SLOCC* that can be simulated by SLOCC. That is, SLOCC* is a set of linear CP maps from two input systems X and Y to two output system A and B such that

$$\mathcal{M} = c\Gamma, \tag{11}$$

where Γ is an element of SLOCC and a positive constant $c > 0$. Note that SLOCC* contains not only TD maps but also trace increasing maps. It is easy to see that LOCC* (or SEP) is a subset of SLOCC* since any element of LOCC* (or SEP) is implementable by SLOCC with a constant success probability independent of inputs.

In the following, we show that a superset of LOCC* where the TP condition is removed from LOCC* is equivalent to SLOCC*. That is, SLOCC* is equivalent to the set of linear CP maps that can be decomposed into the form of



FIG. 3. Class of linear CP maps. The intersection of SLOCC and the set of CPTP maps (TP SLOCC elements) is LOCC since any TP SLOCC element can be implemented by a LOCC protocol. The intersection of SLOCC* and the set of CPTP maps (TP SLOCC* elements) is LOCC*.

Eq. (5). By definition, SLOCC* is equivalent to the set of linear CP maps that can be decomposed into the form of Eq. (10), where k corresponds to a measurement outcome. Without loss of generality, we can restrict $\mathcal{E}_k^A$ and $\mathcal{E}_k^B$ in Eq. (10) to CPTD maps since for all linear CP maps $\mathcal{E}_k^A$, there is a natural number M such that $\frac{1}{M}\mathcal{E}_k^A$ is a CPTD map and $\mathcal{M}$ given by Eq. (10) can be represented by $\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_k \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{i,k}^A \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{i,k}^B$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{i,k}^A = \frac{1}{M}\mathcal{E}_k^A$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{i,k}^B = \mathcal{E}_k^B$. By employing the technique described in Methods, any element of SLOCC* can be decomposed into the form of Eq. (7). Thus, any SLOCC* element can be decomposed into Eq. (5). We summarize the inclusion relation of sets of linear CP maps as shown in Fig. 3.

Any linear CP maps that can be decomposed into the form of Eq. (5) are simulatable by LOCC with post-selection (SLOCC), and vice versa. A connection between post-selection and the causal structure of the spacetime has been discussed in the context of the probabilistic closed time-like curve (p-CTC) in [17–19]. Our result indicates the connection between post-selection and CC* without causal order. In standard spacetime, a map in SEP but not in LOCC can be implemented by LOCC assisted by entanglement. Thus we can recognize that entanglement accompanied with classical communication is used only for enhancing the success probability of a task achievable without entanglement $p < 1$ to $p = 1$ to implement a map in SEP (=LOCC*, but not in LOCC). In this sense, CC* without causal order can be understood as an alternative characterization of the power of entanglement to enhance success probability by effectively changing the partial ordering properties of the spacetime.

DISCUSSION

LOCC* and quantum processes

We discuss the correspondences between our formalism of LOCC* and other formalisms of quantum operations without the assumptions of the partial order of local operations, namely *higher order formalisms* developed by [8, 10]. In the higher order formalisms, the effects of quantum communication linking the local operations of two parties are described as a map that transforms local operations into a deterministic joint quantum operation. The map, called a *quantum process*, is a higher order map (supermap) transforming a quantum operation to another quantum operation, whereas a (normal) map transforms a quantum state to another quantum state. [8] derives the requirements for a quantum process to be consistent with quantum mechanics but without a predefined causal order of local operations. They have shown that there are quantum processes that are not implementable by *quantum* communication linking partially ordered local operations. These requirements for a quantum process to be consistent with quantum mechanics can be interpreted as a new kind of causality, which is different from the special relativistic causality but based only on quantum mechanics. The quantum process shows a new possibility for increasing the speed of quantum computers [20], and implementations of the quantum process are discussed for several settings [21, 22].

A crucial difference between the higher order formalisms and our formalism of LOCC* is that the local operations are linked by quantum communication in the higher order formalisms, but we only allow classical communication between the parties. To compare the two formalisms, we consider a special type of quantum process where quantum communication between the parties is restricted to transmitting a probabilistic mixture of "classical" states, namely, a set of fixed mutually orthogonal states. Such a process is called a *classical* quantum process. In [8], it is shown that a deterministic joint operation described by local operations linked by a classical quantum process does not exhibit the

new causality exhibited by a (fully) quantum process. In Methods, we show that the deterministic joint operations in this case reduce to a probabilistic mixture of two types of operations in one-way LOCC from Alice to Bob and from Bob to Alice. We denote a set of such deterministic joint quantum operations as LOCC** for comparison with LOCC*.

Since LOCC** is a set of probabilistic mixtures of one-way LOCC, LOCC* is a larger set than LOCC**. Therefore, CC* used in implementing non-LOCC quantum operations cannot be a classical quantum process linking two local operations. The gap between LOCC* and LOCC** originates from the conditions imposed on local operations to restrict CC* and a classical quantum process. CC* in LOCC* is only required to guarantee the joint quantum operation to be deterministic for *some* choices of local operations, whereas a classical quantum process in LOCC** is required to guarantee that the joint quantum operation is deterministic for *arbitrary* choices of local operations. Hence CC* is less restricted than a classical quantum process. Considering that CC* is simulated by entanglement assisted classical communication, we can conclude that entanglement provides the power to waive restrictions on classical communication linking local operations originating from both the causality in special relativity and the restriction for classical quantum processes when it is accompanied by classical communication.

METHODS

The Choi-Jamiołkowski representation of quantum operations

To prove the statements presented in Results and Discussion, we make extensive use of the Choi-Jamiołkowski (CJ) representation to represent general quantum operations given by quantum instruments. We denote a CJ representation of a quantum operation described by a map $\mathcal{M}$ by an operator M. The Hilbert spaces of a quantum input system and a quantum output system are denoted by $\mathcal{H}_{in}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{out}$, respectively. $L(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the space of linear operators over a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. For a map representing an element of a quantum instrument $\mathcal{M}_{o|i} : L(\mathcal{H}_{in}) \to L(\mathcal{H}_{out})$, where i is an index of the classical input and o is an index of the classical output, the corresponding CJ operator $M_{o|i} \in L(\mathcal{H}_{in} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{out})$ is given by

$$M_{o|i} = \sum_{k,l} |k\rangle\langle l| \otimes \mathcal{M}_{o|i}(|k\rangle\langle l|), \tag{12}$$

where $\{|k\rangle\}$ is the computational basis on $\mathcal{H}_{in}$. The state of a quantum output for a quantum input ρ_{in} given by a linear map $\mathcal{M}_{o|i}$ is obtained by using the CJ operator $M_{o|i}$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_{o|i}(\rho_{in}) = \mathrm{tr}_{in}[M_{o|i}(\rho_{in}^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{out})] \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{out}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_{out}$, and ρ_{in}^T is the transposition of ρ_{in} with respect to the computational basis. Note that the output state does not depend on the choice of the computational basis. $\mathcal{M}_{o|i}$ is completely positive (CP) if and only if $M_{o|i}$ is a positive semidefinite operator. $\sum_o \mathcal{M}_{o|i}$ is trace preserving (TP) if and only if $\mathrm{tr}_{out}[\sum_o M_{o|i}] = \mathbb{I}_{in}$.

Formal mathematical formulation of LOCC*

We denote the Hilbert spaces of the systems of Alice's quantum input and Bob's quantum input as $\mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$, respectively, and those of Alice's quantum output and Bob's quantum output as $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, respectively. Since LOCC* is defined as a set of CPTP maps $\mathcal{M} : L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y) \to L(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ satisfying Eq. (5), LOCC* is represented by a set of CPTP maps in the CJ representation $M \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ as

$$M = \sum_{i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) A_{o_A|i_A} \otimes B_{o_B|i_B}, \tag{14}$$

where i_A and i_B are classical inputs of Alice and Bob, respectively, and o_A and o_B are classical outputs of Alice and Bob, respectively, and $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ is a conditional probability distribution, $A_{o_A|i_A} \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ is the CJ operator of Alice's local operation and $B_{o_B|i_B} \in L(\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is the CJ operator of the Bob's local operation. Note

that these CJ operators must satisfy

$$\forall i_A, \forall o_A, A_{o_A|i_A} \geq 0, \tag{15}$$

$$\forall i_A, \mathrm{tr}_A \left[\sum_{o_A} A_{o_A|i_A} \right] = \mathbb{I}_X, \tag{16}$$

$$\forall i_B, \forall o_B, B_{o_B|i_B} \geq 0, \tag{17}$$

$$\forall i_B, \mathrm{tr}_B \left[\sum_{o_B} B_{o_B|i_B} \right] = \mathbb{I}_Y. \tag{18}$$

By taking the special conditional probability distribution given by $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) = \delta_{i_A,o_B}\delta_{i_B,o_A}$ in Eq. (14), the set of CPTP maps $M \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ satisfying

$$M = \sum_{a,b} A_{a|b} \otimes B_{b|a} \tag{19}$$

is easily shown to be in a subset of LOCC*. We shall show the converse, namely that any element of LOCC* can be decomposed into this form. For a given conditional probability distribution $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$, let the local operations of Alice and Bob be

$$A_{i_B,x|o_A,o_B} := \sum_{i_A} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) A_{x|i_A} \tag{20}$$

$$B_{o_A,o_B|i_B,x} := \delta^{(x)}_{o_A} B_{o_B|i_B}, \tag{21}$$

by introducing a new index x. Since these newly introduced operators $A_{i_B,x|o_A,o_B}$ and $B_{o_A,o_B|i_B,x}$ satisfy

$$\forall o_A, \forall o_B,\ \mathrm{tr}_A \left[\sum_{i_B,x} A_{i_B,x|o_A,o_B} \right] = \mathbb{I}_X, \qquad \forall i_B, \forall x,\ \mathrm{tr}_B \left[\sum_{o_A,o_B} B_{o_A,o_B|i_B,x} \right] = \mathbb{I}_Y, \tag{22}$$

they are elements of valid local operations. By using these local operations, we have

$$\sum_{i_B,x,o_A,o_B} A_{i_B,x|o_A,o_B} \otimes B_{o_A,o_B|i_B,x} = \sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) A_{o_A|i_A} \otimes B_{o_B|i_B}. \tag{23}$$

Further introducing new classical indices $a := (i_B, x)$ and $b := (o_A, o_B)$, we obtain the form of Eq. (19) where $A_{a|b} \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and $B_{b|a} \in L(\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ satisfy

$$\forall b, \forall a, A_{a|b} \geq 0 \tag{24}$$

$$\forall a, \mathrm{tr}_A \left[\sum_{a} A_{a|b} \right] = \mathbb{I}_X \tag{25}$$

$$\forall a, \forall b, B_{b|a} \geq 0 \tag{26}$$

$$\forall a, \mathrm{tr}_B \left[\sum_{b} B_{b|a} \right] = \mathbb{I}_Y. \tag{27}$$

Equivalence of LOCC* and SEP

For a deterministic joint quantum operation $\mathcal{M} : L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y) \to L(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ in SEP defined by Eq. (10), the corresponding CJ operator $M \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is given by

$$M = \sum_{k=1}^{K} E^A_k \otimes E^B_k, \tag{28}$$

where $E_k^A \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and $E_k^B \in L(\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ satisfy

$$E_k^A \geq 0, \qquad E_k^B \geq 0, \tag{29}$$

for all k. It is easy to see that LOCC* represented by Eq. (19) is a subset of SEP. We shall show the converse, namely that it is possible to construct local operators $A_{a|b} \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and $B_{b|a} \in L(\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ LOCC* for any given SEP element.

First we show that we can restrict SEP operators to

$$\mathrm{tr}_A \left[E_k^A\right] \leq \mathbb{I}_X, \qquad \mathrm{tr}_B \left[E_k^B\right] \leq \mathbb{I}_Y, \tag{30}$$

for all k in addition to Eq. (29) without loss of generality. Since the CJ operator M defined by Eq. (28) is TP and the SEP operators are positive, we obtain

$$\forall k, \mathrm{tr}_{AB} \left[E_k^A \otimes E_k^B\right] = \mathrm{tr}_A \left[E_k^A\right] \otimes \mathrm{tr}_B \left[E_k^B\right] \leq \mathbb{I}_{XY}. \tag{31}$$

Since $\mathrm{tr}_A \left[E_k^A\right]$ and $\mathrm{tr}_B \left[E_k^B\right]$ are positive, they are diagonalizable. Let the eigenvalues of $\mathrm{tr}_A \left[E_k^A\right]$ and $\mathrm{tr}_B \left[E_k^B\right]$ be $\{\lambda_i^A\}$ and $\{\lambda_j^B\}$, respectively. Eq. (31) implies

$$\max_i\{\lambda_i^A\} \max_j\{\lambda_j^B\} \leq 1. \tag{32}$$

If $\max_i\{\lambda_i^A\} \leq 1$ and $\max_j\{\lambda_j^B\} \leq 1$, Eq. (30) is satisfied. We assume that $\max_i\{\lambda_i^A\} \geq 1$ and define

$$\tilde{E_k^A} = \frac{1}{\max_i\{\lambda_i^A\}} E_k^A, \qquad \tilde{E_k^B} = \max_i\{\lambda_i^A\} E_k^B. \tag{33}$$

Due to $\tilde{E_k^A} \otimes \tilde{E_k^B} = E_k^A \otimes E_k^B$, the SEP operators E_k^A and E_k^B can be replaced by $\tilde{E_k^A}$ and $\tilde{E_k^B}$. Then the validity of Eq. (30) is confirmed.

Below we present the construction of local operators for LOCC*.

$$A_{k|k} = E_k^A \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq K \tag{34}$$

$$B_{k|k} = E_k^B \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq K \tag{35}$$

$$A_{L+1|k} = \frac{1}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_A)} \left(\mathbb{I}_X - \mathrm{tr}_A \left[E_k^A\right]\right) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq K \tag{36}$$

$$B_{L+1|k} = \frac{1}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_B)} \left(\mathbb{I}_Y - \mathrm{tr}_B \left[E_k^B\right]\right) \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq K \tag{37}$$

$$A_{a|b} = \frac{1}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_A)} \mathbb{I}_X \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \quad \text{for } b > K, K+2 \leq a \leq K+3 \text{ and } a+b \equiv 1 \mod 2 \tag{38}$$

$$B_{b|a} = \frac{1}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_B)} \mathbb{I}_Y \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \quad \text{for } a > K, K+2 \leq b \leq K+3 \text{ and } a+b \equiv 0 \mod 2 \tag{39}$$

$$A_{a|b} = 0 \quad \text{else,} \tag{40}$$

$$B_{b|a} = 0 \quad \text{else.} \tag{41}$$

When the summations of the local operators are taken to form an element of LOCC* as in Eq. (19), the indices a and b run from 1 to $K+3$.

Relationship between CC* and classical quantum processes

A quantum process [8] is a higher order map transforming quantum operations to another quantum operation. We analyze the relationship between CC* in LOCC* and classical quantum processes in the higher order formalism using the CJ operator representation. We denote the set of all positive semi-definite operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ as $Pos(\mathcal{H})$ and the set of all CJ operators on $\mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O$ representing CPTP maps from $\mathcal{H}_I$ to $\mathcal{H}_O$ as $CPTP(\mathcal{H}_I : \mathcal{H}_O) = \{Q \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O) | \mathrm{tr}_O Q = \mathbb{I}_I\}$.

To be consistent with quantum mechanics, it has been proven in [8] that a quantum process linking two local operations represented by the CJ operators $M_A \in L(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A})$ and $M_B \in L(\mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$ as inputs can be

represented by a positive semi-definite operator $W \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$, which is called a *process matrix* and that satisfies

$$\forall M_A \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} : \mathcal{H}_{O_A}), \forall M_B \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_{I_B} : \mathcal{H}_{O_B}),\ \mathrm{tr}\big[W(M_A^{\mathrm{T}} \otimes M_B^{\mathrm{T}})\big] = 1, \tag{42}$$

where Q^{T} represents the transposition of Q with respect to the computational basis used in defining the CJ representation.

A deterministic joint quantum operation $\mathcal{M} : L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{M}_Y) \to L(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ can be regarded as being obtained by transforming two local operations $\mathcal{A} : L(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X) \to L(\mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and $\mathcal{B} : L(\mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y) \to L(\mathcal{H}_{O_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ by a quantum process $W \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$ linking the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{I_A}$, $\mathcal{H}_{O_A}$, $\mathcal{H}_{I_B}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{O_B}$. The CJ operator $M \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ of $\mathcal{M}$ obtained by transforming the CJ operators of local operations $A \in L(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and $B \in L(\mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ corresponding to $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively, by W satisfying Eq. (42) is represented by

$$M = \mathrm{tr}_{I_A,O_A,I_B,O_B}\big[W(A^{\mathrm{T}_{I_A,O_A}} \otimes B^{\mathrm{T}_{I_B,O_B}})\big], \tag{43}$$

where $Q^{\mathrm{T}_{I_X,O_X}}$ is the partial transposition of Q, taking the transposition only in terms of $\mathcal{H}_{I_X}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{O_X}$.

Quantum communication from Alice to Bob or Bob to Alice can be described by W if W is equivalent to the CJ operator representing a quantum channel linking two causally ordered local operations belonging to different parties. Moreover, quantum processes can represent "quantum communication" without causal order, which is not implementable when the partial order of local operations is fixed but is not ruled out in the framework of quantum mechanics [8]. The restriction for quantum processes given by Eq. (42) can be interpreted to represent a new kind of causality required for linking local operations in quantum mechanics.

We consider a special class of quantum process where Alice and Bob can communicate only by "classical" states. In this case, the states on the local input and output Hilbert spaces of W, $\mathcal{H}_{I_A}$, $\mathcal{H}_{O_A}$, $\mathcal{H}_{I_B}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{O_B}$, are restricted and are diagonal with respect to the computational basis. In such a case, *classical* quantum processes representing classical communication between the parties can be described by a conditional probability distribution $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) A_{o_A|i_A} \otimes B_{o_B|i_B} \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y : \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \tag{44}$$

for all quantum instruments $\{A_{o_A|i_A}\}_{o_A}$ and $\{B_{o_B|i_B}\}_{o_B}$, where $\{A_{o_A|i_A} \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)\}_{o_A}$ and $\{B_{o_B|i_B} \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)\}_{o_B}$ satisfying $\sum_{o_A} \mathrm{tr}_A[A_{o_A|i_A}] = \mathbb{I}_X$ and $\sum_{o_B} \mathrm{tr}_B[B_{o_B|i_B}] = \mathbb{I}_Y$. The proof is given in Supplementary Method.

A deterministic joint quantum operation $\mathcal{M}$ that can be implemented by a classical quantum process connecting two local operations is given in the form of

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) \mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}, \tag{45}$$

where $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ is a conditional probability distribution satisfying Eq. (44). We refer to the set of such joint quantum operations as LOCC**. By definition, LOCC* is a larger set than LOCC** since the condition for $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ given by Eq. (44) should be satisfied for *all* local operations in LOCC** while it should be satisfied only for *some* local operations in LOCC*. In Supplementary Methods, we prove that LOCC** is equivalent to a probability mixture of one-way LOCC in a bipartite scenario. Thus, CC* used in implementing a deterministic joint quantum computation in LOCC* but not in LOCC cannot be represented by a classical quantum process. This indicates that the required causal property for "classical communication" linking local operations is weakened for CC* compared with the causality in special relativity and also with the restriction for classical quantum processes.

Relationship between LOCC and causal order

We analyze the relationship between LOCC and the special relativistic causal order of local operations performed in spacetime by generalizing a LOCC scenario in a special relativistic framework. In this scenario, suppose Alice and Bob reside in separate laboratories in spacetime obeying special relativity. They perform local operations N times within each laboratory. Each local operation is assumed to be implemented in a very short time so that it is performed at a single spacetime coordinate. We assume that the order of the local operations in each laboratory is fixed. However, we do not need to fix the total ordering of the local operations across the two parties in contrast to the standard LOCC scenario.

We denote the k-th local operations of Alice and Bob as $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k}$. In this generalized scenario, Alice (Bob) receives classical input i_k (i'_k) from outside her (his) laboratory and performs $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ ($\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k}$) and then sends classical output o_k (o'_k) outside her (his) laboratory. The deterministic joint quantum operation in this case can be written in the form of Eq. (4) by means of $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ linking the classical outputs and the classical inputs of the local operations.

The assumption of special relativity adds two conditions for linking two local operations. An ordering denoted by "$\prec$" over local operations associated by the spacetime coordinates is introduced to represent these conditions. We define $a \prec b$ if the spacetime coordinate of operation a is in the past light cone of the spacetime coordinate of operation b. If neither $a \prec b$ nor $b \prec a$ holds then the spacetime coordinates of a and b are *spacelike* separated. Special relativity guarantees that this ordering is a partial ordering. Thus, there is a partial ordering "$\prec$" over a set of local quantum operations. Since local operations within each laboratory are totally ordered by the assumption, the partial ordering must satisfy $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1} \prec \cdots \prec \mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{o'_1|i'_1} \prec \cdots \prec \mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|i'_N}$. Further, $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ must satisfy the no-signaling condition. That is, for all local operations, the input of a local operation cannot depend on the output of another local operation not performed in the past. For example, if $\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l} \prec \mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k} \prec \mathcal{B}^{(m)}_{o'_m|i'_m}$, then

$$p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_k,i'_1,\cdots,i'_l|o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N\right) = p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_k,i'_1,\cdots,i'_l|o_1,\cdots,o_{k-1},o'_1,\cdots,o'_{m-1}\right)$$

should be satisfied.

We can show that a deterministic joint quantum operation is in LOCC if and only if it has a decomposition in Eq. (4), there is a partial ordering over local quantum operations, and $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ in Eq. (4) satisfies the no-signaling condition with respect to the partial ordering. The proof of this statement is slightly involved and given in Supplementary Methods. This property of deterministic joint quantum operations in the form of Eq. (4) suggests that LOCC is a set of all possible deterministic joint quantum operations implementable by local operations and *classical communication respecting causal order*.

SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS

Equivalence of classical quantum process and conditional probability distribution

A *classical quantum process* represents a link between local operations for a situation where Alice and Bob can communicate only via "classical" states. In this case, the states on the local input and output Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{I_A}$, $\mathcal{H}_{O_A}$, $\mathcal{H}_{I_B}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{O_B}$ of a process matrix W must be diagonal with respect to the computational basis. By denoting the computational basis of $\mathcal{H}_X$ as $\{|x\rangle_X\}$, local operations $M_A \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} : \mathcal{H}_{O_A})$, $M_B \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_{I_B} : \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$, and a classical quantum process described by a diagonal process matrix $W \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$ can be decomposed into

$$M_A = \sum_{i_A,o_A} p_A(o_A|i_A)|i_A, o_A\rangle\langle i_A, o_A|_{I_A,O_A}, \tag{46}$$

$$M_B = \sum_{i_B,o_B} p_B(o_B|i_B)|i_B, o_B\rangle\langle i_B, o_B|_{I_B,O_B}, \tag{47}$$

$$W = \sum_{i_A,o_A,i_B,o_B} w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B)|i_A\rangle\langle i_A|_{I_A} \otimes |i_B\rangle\langle i_B|_{I_B} \otimes |o_A\rangle\langle o_A|_{O_A} \otimes |o_B\rangle\langle o_B|_{O_B}, \tag{48}$$

where $w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B)$ represents a diagonal element of W, and $p_A(o_A|i_A)$ and $p_B(o_B|i_B)$ are conditional probability distributions since M_A and M_A are CPTP maps. In the following, we show that classical quantum processes correspond to conditional probability distributions, namely, $w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B)$ must be a conditional probability distribution so that Eq. (42) holds. The non-negativity of W implies $w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B) \geq 0$ and the condition given by Eq. (42) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B)p_A(o_A|i_A)p_B(o_B|i_B) = 1 \tag{49}$$

for all conditional probability distributions $p_A(o_A|i_A)$ and $p_B(o_B|i_B)$. By choosing $p_A(o_A|i_A) = \delta_{o_A,a}$ and $p_B(o_B|i_B) = \delta_{o_B,b}$, we obtain $\sum_{i_A,i_B} w(i_A, i_B, a, b) = 1$ for arbitrary a and b. Thus $w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B)$ can be represented by a conditional probability distribution conditioned by o_A and o_B, and we define

$$p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) := w(i_A, i_B, o_A, o_B). \tag{50}$$

Next, we define a set of deterministic joint quantum operations consisting of local operations linked by a classical quantum process, denoted by LOCC**. Local operations $A \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X : \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and $B \in CPTP(\mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y : \mathcal{H}_{O_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ linked by a diagonal process matrix $W \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$ given in the form of Eq. (48) can be decomposed into

$$A = \sum_{i_A,o_A} A_{o_A|i_A} \otimes |i_A, o_A\rangle\langle i_A, o_A|_{I_A,O_A}, \tag{51}$$

$$B = \sum_{i_B,o_B} B_{o_B|i_B} \otimes |i_B, o_B\rangle\langle i_B, o_B|_{I_B,O_B}, \tag{52}$$

where $\{A_{o_A|i_A} \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)\}_{o_A}$ and $\{B_{o_B|i_B} \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)\}_{o_B}$ are the CJ operators of quantum instruments since A and B are CPTP maps. By straightforward calculation, the CJ operator of a deterministic joint quantum operation is written as

$$M = \mathrm{tr}_{I_A,O_A,I_B,O_B}\left[W(A^{\mathrm{T}_{I_A,O_A}} \otimes B^{\mathrm{T}_{I_B,O_B}})\right] \tag{53}$$

$$= \sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)A_{o_A|i_A} \otimes B_{o_B|i_B}, \tag{54}$$

which shows the equivalence of the representations of M given by Eq. (14) and Eq. (43) when the process is diagonal/classical. LOCC** is defined by a set of deterministic joint quantum operations whose CJ operators can be represented by Eq. (54), where $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ satisfies

$$\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)p_A(o_A|i_A)p_B(o_B|i_B) = 1 \tag{55}$$

for all conditional probability distributions $p_A(o_A|i_A)$ and $p_B(o_B|i_B)$.

Furthermore, the condition given by Eq. (55) is equivalent to that given by Eq. (44) if $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ is a conditional probability distribution. This can be shown as follows. By letting $dim(\mathcal{H}_X) = dim(\mathcal{H}_Y) = dim(\mathcal{H}_A) = dim(\mathcal{H}_B) = 1$, $A_{o_A|i_A} = p(o_A|i_A)$ and $B_{o_B|i_B} = p(o_B|i_B)$, it is easy to confirm that Eq. (55) holds if Eq. (44) holds. To show the converse, we first check that a map decomposable in the form of Eq. (44) is completely positive. This is also easily checked since every term in the summation is non-negative. Then we show that a map decomposable in the form of Eq. (44) is trace preserving when Eq. (55) holds in the following. For any operator $\sigma \in L(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y)$,

$$\mathrm{tr}_{A,B}\left[\mathrm{tr}_{X,Y}\left[\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)(A_{o_A|i_A} \otimes B_{o_B|i_B})\sigma^{\mathrm{T}}\right]\right] \tag{56}$$

$$= \sum_{k,l} \lambda_{k,l} \sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B} p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)\mathrm{tr}_{A,X}\left[A_{o_A|i_A}\rho_k^{\mathrm{T}}\right]\mathrm{tr}_{B,Y}\left[B_{o_B|i_B}\rho_l^{\mathrm{T}}\right] \tag{57}$$

$$= \sum_{k,l} \lambda_{k,l} = \mathrm{tr}[\sigma], \tag{58}$$

where σ is decomposed as $\sigma = \sum_{k,l} \lambda_{k,l}\rho_k \otimes \rho_l$ by using density operators $\{\rho_k\}_k$ as a basis of the linear space of the operator. Note that $\mathrm{tr}_{A,X}\left[A_{o_A|i_A}\rho_k^T\right]$ is a conditional probability distribution conditioned by i_A since it satisfies $\sum_{o_A} \mathrm{tr}_{A,X}\left[A_{o_A|i_A}\rho_k^T\right] = \mathrm{tr}_{A,X}\left[\sum_{o_A} A_{o_A|i_A}\rho_k^T\right] = \mathrm{tr}_X\left[\rho_k^T\right] = 1$.

Equivalence of LOCC** and a probabilistic mixture of one-way LOCC

We show a proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *LOCC** is equivalent to a probability mixture of one-way LOCC in bipartite cases.*

Proof. In [8], it is shown that any classical quantum process is *causally separable*, i.e. the CJ operator of a classical quantum process W can be decomposed into the form

$$W = qW_{A\to B} + (1-q)W_{B\to A}, \tag{59}$$

where $q \in [0, 1]$, $W_{A\to B} \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$ is diagonal with respect to the computational basis and satisfies the conditions given by

$$W_{A\to B} = \mathbb{I}_{O_B} \otimes W_{I_A,O_A,I_B}, \qquad \mathrm{tr}_{I_B}\left[W_{I_A,O_A,I_B}\right] = \mathbb{I}_{O_A} \otimes \rho_{I_A}, \qquad \mathrm{tr}_{I_A}\left[\rho_{I_A}\right] = 1, \tag{60}$$

and similar conditions are satisfied by $W_{B\to A} \in Pos(\mathcal{H}_{I_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_B})$.

In [9], it is proven that an operator $W_{A\to B}$ satisfying the conditions given by Eq. (60) but not necessarily being diagonal in the computational basis corresponds to a special type of quantum process called *quantum comb* where Alice's operation and Bob's operation are linked by quantum communication from Alice to Bob. Thus a causally separable process can be interpreted as a probabilistic mixture of quantum communication from Alice to Bob and from Bob to Alice. When a causally separable process is classical (diagonal with respect to the computational basis), the process can be interpreted as a probabilistic mixture of classical communication from Alice to Bob and from Bob to Alice.

Let us denote the diagonal elements of $W_{A\to B}$ and $W_{B\to A}$ with respect to the computational basis by $p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ and $p_{B\to A}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$, respectively. It is easy to verify that $p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ and $p_{B\to A}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ are conditional probability distributions since $W_{A\to B}$ and $W_{B\to A}$ correspond to classical quantum processes.

Then $p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ satisfying Eq. (44) can be decomposed into

$$p(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) = qp_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B) + (1-q)p_{B\to A}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B). \tag{61}$$

Eq. (60) implies that $p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$ does not depend on o_B. We define $p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A) := p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A, o_B)$. The operator W_{I_A,O_A,I_B} in Eq. (60) is given by

$$W_{I_A,O_A,I_B} = \sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A} p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A)|i_A\rangle\langle i_A|_{I_A} \otimes |o_A\rangle\langle o_A|_{O_A} \otimes |i_B\rangle\langle i_B|_{I_B}. \tag{62}$$

Due to Eq. (60), $\sum_{i_B} p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A)$ does not depend on o_A. We define $p_{A\to B}(i_A) := \sum_{i_B} p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A)$. We further define a set $X = \{x|p_{A\to B}(x) \neq 0\}$ and

$$p'_{A\to B}(i_B|o_A, i_A) := \frac{p_{A\to B}(i_A, i_B|o_A)}{p_{A\to B}(i_A)} \quad (i_A \in X) \tag{63}$$

$$p'_{A\to B}(i_B|o_A, i_A) := p'_{A\to B}(i_B) \quad (i_A \notin X), \tag{64}$$

where $p'_{A\to B}(y)$ is an arbitrary probability distribution. Note that $p'_{A\to B}(i_B|o_A,i_A)$ satisfies all the properties required for a conditional probability distribution. Thus, we have

$$p_{A\to B}(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)=p_{A\to B}(i_A)p'_{A\to B}(i_B|o_A,i_A), \tag{65}$$

and similarly,

$$p_{B\to A}(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)=p_{B\to A}(i_B)p'_{B\to A}(i_A|o_B,i_B). \tag{66}$$

Combining these results, a deterministic joint quantum operation $\mathcal{M}$ in LOCC** is given by

$$\mathcal{M}=q\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B}p_{A\to B}(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\otimes\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}+(1-q)\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B}p_{B\to A}(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\otimes\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}. \tag{67}$$

Since $\sum_{i_A,i_B,o_A,o_B}p_{A\to B}(i_A,i_B|o_A,o_B)\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A}\otimes\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B}=\sum_m\mathcal{A}_m\otimes\mathcal{B}_{|m}$ where

$$m:=(i_A,o_A),\ \mathcal{A}_{i_A,o_A}:=p_{A\to B}(i_A)\mathcal{A}_{o_A|i_A},\ \mathcal{B}_{|i_A,o_A}:=\sum_{i_B,o_B}p'_{A\to B}(i_B|o_A,i_A)\mathcal{B}_{o_B|i_B} \tag{68}$$

represents operations in one-way LOCC. The deterministic joint quantum operation $\mathcal{M}$ in LOCC** is concluded to be a probability mixture of one-way LOCC.

□

Relationship between LOCC and causal order

In Results, we stated that any deterministic joint quantum operation in LOCC can be written in the form of Eq. (4) but not all quantum operations written as Eq. (4) are LOCC. In this supplementary note, we show a necessary and sufficient condition for a deterministic joint quantum operation in the form of Eq. (4) to be in LOCC. We show that the condition is related to a special relativistic *causal order* of local operations.

We regard $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ in Eq. (4) linking the outputs and inputs of local operations as a classical channel between $2N$ inputs $\{o_k\}_{k=1}^N\cup\{o'_k\}_{k=1}^N$ and $2N$ outputs $\{i_k\}_{k=1}^N\cup\{i'_k\}_{k=1}^N$. Note that an input i_k for a local operation $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ is an output of the classical channel. Suppose there is a strict partial ordering "$\prec$" on the set of local operations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N\cup\{\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N$, where "strict" means that neither $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ nor $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ holds, and $\{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N$ and $\{\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N$ are local operations performed in the laboratories of Alice and Bob, respectively. Each local operation is assumed to be implemented in a very short time so that it is performed at a single spacetime coordinate and is associated with it. We assume the order of local operations in each laboratory is fixed and that local operations are performed in the increasing order of k, which is the assumption of local temporal ordering that we introduced in Methods.

Suppose that this partial ordering $\prec$ represents the causal order of the spacetime coordinates of local operations. For example, $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}$ means that $\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}$ is performed after $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ had been performed. Neither $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}$ nor $\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}\prec\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ holds if the spacetime coordinates of $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}$ are spacelike separated. Due to the assumption of local temporal ordering, $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_{k+1}|i_{k+1}}$ is performed after $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}$, thus "$\prec$" satisfies $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_{k+1}|i_{k+1}}$ for all $k=1,\cdots,N-1$. Similarly, it satisfies $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k}\prec\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_{k+1}|i'_{k+1}}$ for all $k=1,\cdots,N-1$.

We define a set $past(\mathfrak{I})$ representing a set of all "*past*" inputs for a set of outputs $\mathfrak{I}$, where $\mathfrak{I}$ is a subset of $\{i_k\}_{k=1}^N\cup\{i'_k\}_{k=1}^N$. Formally, by introducing a set of local operations $Op\left(\mathfrak{I}\right)$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{I}$ as

$$Op\left(\mathfrak{I}\right):=\left\{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}|i_k\in\mathfrak{I}\right\}\cup\left\{\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k}|i'_k\in\mathfrak{I}\right\}, \tag{69}$$

$past(\mathfrak{I})$ is defined as

$$past\left(\mathfrak{I}\right):=\{o_k|\exists\chi\in Op\left(\mathfrak{I}\right),\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\chi\}\cup\{o'_k|\exists\chi\in Op\left(\mathfrak{I}\right),\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k}\prec\chi\}, \tag{70}$$

where χ represents any element of $Op\left(\mathfrak{I}\right)$, that is, there is l such that $\chi=\mathcal{A}^{(l)}_{o_l|i_l}$ or $\chi=\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}$. Note that o_k is not in $past\left(\{i_k\}\right)$ by definition.

Next we define a classical channel respecting the causal order. A classical channel $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ linking the classical outputs and inputs of local operations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N\cup\{\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N$ is said to be respecting causal order if there is a partial ordering $\prec$ on the set of local operations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N\cup\{\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^N$ satisfying the following conditions:

- For all k, $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k} \prec \mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_{k+1}|i_{k+1}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k} \prec \mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_{k+1}|i'_{k+1}}$.
- For all k and l,

$$p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_k,i'_1,\cdots i'_l|o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)=p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_k,i'_1,\cdots i'_l|past\left(\{i_a\}_{a=1}^{k}\cup\{i'_b\}_{b=1}^{l}\right)\right). \tag{71}$$

Since the classical channel is represented by a conditional probability distribution,

$$p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_k,i'_1,\cdots i'_l|o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)=\sum_{i_{k+1},\cdots i_N,i'_{l+1}\cdots i_N} p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_N,i'_1,\cdots i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N\right) \tag{72}$$

holds. Hence Eq. (71) can be regarded as representing the no-signaling condition among multiple spacetime coordinates, namely, outputs of the classical channel never depend on inputs that are not in the past of the outputs. In other words, classical communication represented by a classical channel respects a causal order if and only if there is a partial ordering among local operations and the classical channel satisfies the no-signaling condition with respect to the partial ordering.

We present the main proposition regarding the relationship between LOCC and causal order.

Proposition 1. *A deterministic joint quantum operation is in LOCC, if and only if it has a decomposition in the form of Eq. (4) with $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ respecting the causal order.*

From the proposition, we immediately derive the following corollary about LOCC*.

Corollary 1. *A deterministic joint quantum operation is in LOCC* and not in LOCC, if and only if it has a decomposition in the form of Eq. (4) with $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ and for all such decompositions, $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ does not respect causal order.*

Since the proposition is a necessary and sufficient condition for LOCC, it gives a new characterization of LOCC in terms of $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ and similarly, the corollary gives a new characterization of a deterministic joint quantum operation in LOCC* and not in LOCC, which is nothing but a non-LOCC separable quantum operation as we have shown in Results, in terms of causal order.

Proof

We provide a proof of the main proposition in the remaining part of Supplementary Methods. Since the conventional definition of LOCC in Eq. (2) using the totally ordered local operations immediately gives a decomposition with $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ respecting causal order, the "only if" part is trivial. Hence we concentrate on proving the "if" part of the proposition.

This proof consists of two parts. In Part A, we show that for given local operations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^{N}\cup\{\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\}_{k=1}^{N}$ and classical channel $p\left(i_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)$ representing a deterministic joint quantum operation by Eq. (4), it is always possible to construct sets of *totally* ordered local operations $\left\{\mathcal{C}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}}\right\}_{k=1}^{N}$ and $\left\{\mathcal{D}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}}\right\}_{k=1}^{N}$, where the input $\mathbb{J}_l$ of a local operation depends only on the output $\mathbb{O}_{l-1}$ of the previous local operation, representing the deterministic joint quantum operation by choosing an appropriate classical channel. In Part B, we show that another pair of sets of totally ordered local operations $\left\{\mathcal{C}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}}\right\}_{k=1}^{N}$ and $\left\{\mathcal{D}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}}\right\}_{k=1}^{N}$ from the local operations and the classical channel constructed in Part A. The standard form of LOCC given by Eq. (2) is derived by using this pair of sets of totally ordered local operations.

Part A

Since there is always a total ordering that preserves the structure of a given partial ordering on a finite set, we define a map f satisfying

- f is a bijection from $\{1,\cdots,N\}\times\{0,1\}$ to $\{1,\cdots,2N\}$.
- $f(k,b)<f(k+1,b)$ for all k and b.
- $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{o_k|i_k}\prec\mathcal{B}^{(l)}_{o'_l|i'_l}\Rightarrow f(k,0)<f(l,1)$, and $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{o'_k|i'_k}\prec\mathcal{A}^{(l)}_{o_l|i_l}\Rightarrow f(k,1)<f(l,0)$ for all k and l.

By means of f, we define a set of classical inputs $\{I_l\}_{l=1}^{2N}$ and a set of outputs $\{O_l\}_{l=1}^{2N}$ whose elements are given by

$$I_{f(k,0)} = i_k,\ I_{f(k,1)} = i'_k,\ O_{f(k,0)} = o_k,\ \text{and}\ O_{f(k,1)} = o'_k \tag{73}$$

for all k. We further define a conditional probability distribution $q(I_1, \cdots I_{2N}|O_1, \cdots O_{2N})$ by

$$q(I_1, \cdots, I_{2N}|O_1, \cdots, O_{2N}) := p(i_1, \cdots, i_N, i'_1, \cdots i'_N|o_1, \cdots, o_N, o'_1, \cdots, o'_N), \tag{74}$$

where I_l and O_l are related to i_k, i'_k, o_k, and o'_k by Eq. (73). Thus $q(\cdots|\cdots)$ is another representation of $p(\cdots|\cdots)$ in terms of the newly defined classical inputs and outputs $\{I_l\}_{l=1}^{2N}$ and $\{O_l\}_{l=1}^{2N}$. Using $q(I_1, \cdots I_{2N}|O_1, \cdots O_{2N})$, the condition for $p\left(i_1, \cdots, i'_N|o_1, \cdots, o'_N\right)$ to satisfy causal order given by Eq. (71) for all k and l is expressed by

$$q(I_1, \cdots, I_k|O_1, \cdots, O_{2N}) = q(I_1, \cdots, I_k|O_1, \cdots, O_{k-1}) \tag{75}$$

for all k.

Next, we define sets of all possible values of I_k and O_k denoted by $\mathcal{I}_k$ and $\mathcal{O}_k$, respectively, for $k = 1, \cdots 2N$. We represent variables whose variations are over $\prod_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{I}_j \times \prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{O}_j$ and $\prod_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{I}_j \times \prod_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{O}_j$ by $\mathbb{J}_k$ and $\mathbb{O}_k$, respectively. $\{\mathbb{J}_k\}_{k=1}^{2N}$ and $\{\mathbb{O}_k\}_{k=1}^{2N}$ are classical inputs and outputs of new local operations, which will be introduced latter. We define a function $Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1})$ representing a classical channel linking between $\mathbb{J}_k$ and $\mathbb{O}_{k-1}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1}) :=& \frac{q(I_1, \cdots, I_k|O_1, \cdots, O_{k-1})}{q(I_1, \cdots, I_{k-1}|O_1, \cdots, O_{k-2})} \cdot \delta\left(\mathbb{J}_k[1, k-1], \mathbb{O}_{k-1}[1, k-1]\right) \\ & \cdot \delta\left(\mathbb{J}_k[k+1, 2k-1], \mathbb{O}_{k-1}[k, 2k-2]\right), \quad (2 \le k \le 2N) \qquad (76) \\ Q(\mathbb{J}_1) :=& q(I_1), \qquad (77) \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta(x, y)$ is the Kronecker delta, $\mathbb{J}_k = (I_1, \cdots I_k, O_1, \cdots, O_{k-1})$ for $2 \le k \le 2N$, $\mathbb{J}_1 = I_1$, and $\mathbb{J}_k[l, m]$ is a vector consisting of the partial entries of $\mathbb{J}_k$, from the l-th entry through the m-th entry for $l < m$.

It is easy to check that $Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbb{J}_1, \cdots, \mathbb{J}_{2N}} Q(\mathbb{J}_1) \cdot \delta(\mathbb{J}_1, \mathbb{O}_1[1]) \prod_{k=2}^{2N} Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1}) \cdot \delta(\mathbb{J}_k, \mathbb{O}_k[1, 2k-1]) \\ =& q(I_1^{(2N)}, \cdots I_{2N}^{(2N)}|O_1^{(2N)}, \cdots, O_{2N}^{(2N)}) \cdot \\ & \prod_{k=2}^{2N} \delta\left((I_1^{(k)}, \cdots, I_{k-1}^{(k)}, O_1^{(k)}, \cdots, O_{k-1}^{(k)}), (I_1^{(k-1)}, \cdots, I_{k-1}^{(k-1)}, O_1^{(k-1)}, \cdots, O_{k-1}^{(k-1)})\right), \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where $I_l^{(k)}$ and $O_l^{(k)}$ are given by $\mathbb{O}_k = (I_1^{(k)}, \cdots, I_k^{(k)}, O_1^{(k)}, \cdots O_k^{(k)})$, and $\mathbb{O}_k[l]$ denotes the l-th entry of $\mathbb{O}_k$. Eq. (78) indicates that $Q(\mathbb{J}_1)\prod_{k=2}^{2N} Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1})$ and $q(I_1^{(2N)}, \cdots I_{2N}^{(2N)}|O_1^{(2N)}, \cdots, O_{2N}^{(2N)})$ represent the same classical channel if $\mathbb{J}_k = \mathbb{O}_k[1, k-1]$, $\mathbb{O}_k[1, k-1] = \mathbb{O}_{k-1}[1, k-1]$, and $\mathbb{O}_k[k+1, 2k] = \mathbb{O}_{k-1}[k, 2k-2]$ are satisfied.

We define a local operation performed in Alice's laboratory for $\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}$ and $\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}$ denoted by $\mathcal{C}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}}$ as

$$\mathcal{C}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}} := \delta\left(\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}, \mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}[1, 2f(k,0)-1]\right) \cdot \mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}[2f(k,0)]|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}[f(k,0)]}, \tag{79}$$

where $\mathbb{O}_1[1, 1] := \mathbb{O}_1[1]$ for $f(k, 0) = 1$ and $\mathbb{J}_k[l]$ represents the l-th entry of $\mathbb{J}_k$. Similarly, we define a local operation performed in Bob's laboratory denoted by $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}}$ as

$$\mathcal{D}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}} := \delta\left(\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}, \mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}[1, 2f(k,1)-1]\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}[2f(k,1)]|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}[f(k,1)]}. \tag{80}$$

By linking classical outputs and inputs of local operations $\mathcal{C}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}}$ satisfying the total ordering introduced by the function f, we derive a representation of the deterministic joint quantum operation given

by Eq. (4) as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathbb{J}_1,\cdots,\mathbb{J}_{2N},\mathbb{O}_1,\cdots,\mathbb{O}_{2N}} Q(\mathbb{J}_1)\cdot\left(\prod_{k=2}^{2N} Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1})\right)\mathcal{C}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(N,0)}}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{C}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(1,0)}}\otimes\mathcal{D}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(N,1)}}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{D}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(1,1)}}\\
=&\sum_{\mathbb{J}_1,\cdots,\mathbb{J}_{2N},\mathbb{O}_1,\cdots,\mathbb{O}_{2N}} Q(\mathbb{J}_1)\cdot\delta\left(\mathbb{J}_1|\mathbb{O}_1[1]\right)\cdot\Big(\prod_{k=2}^{2N} Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1})\cdot\delta\left(\mathbb{J}_k,\mathbb{O}_k[1,2k-1]\right)\Big)\\
&\quad\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)}[2f(N,0)]|\mathbb{J}_{f(N,0)}[f(N,0)]}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,0)}[2f(1,0)]|\mathbb{J}_{f(1,0)}[f(1,0)]}\\
&\quad\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,1)}[2f(N,1)]|\mathbb{J}_{f(N,1)}[f(N,1)]}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,1)}[2f(1,1)]|\mathbb{J}_{f(1,1)}[f(1,1)]}\\
=&\sum_{\mathbb{O}_1,\cdots,\mathbb{O}_{2N}} q(I_1^{(2N)},\cdots I_{2N}^{(2N)}|O_1^{(2N)},\cdots,O_{2N}^{(2N)})\cdot\\
&\quad\prod_{k=2}^{2N}\delta\left((I_1^{(k)},\cdots,I_{k-1}^{(k)},O_1^{(k)},\cdots,O_{k-1}^{(k)}),(I_1^{(k-1)},\cdots,I_{k-1}^{(k-1)},O_1^{(k-1)},\cdots,O_{k-1}^{(k-1)})\right),\\
&\quad\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)}[2f(N,0)]|\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)}[f(N,0)]}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,0)}[2f(1,0)]|\mathbb{O}_{f(1,0)}[f(1,0)]}\\
&\quad\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,1)}[2f(N,1)]|\mathbb{O}_{f(N,1)}[f(N,1)]}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,1)}[2f(1,1)]|\mathbb{O}_{f(1,1)}[f(1,1)]}\\
=&\sum_{\mathbb{O}_{2N}} q(I_1^{(2N)},\cdots I_{2N}^{(2N)}|O_1^{(2N)},\cdots,O_{2N}^{(2N)})\cdot\\
&\quad\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{2N}[N+f(N,0)]|\mathbb{O}_{2N}[f(N,0)]}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{1,\mathbb{O}_{2N}[N+f(1,0)]|\mathbb{O}_{2N}[f(1,0)]}\\
&\quad\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{N,\mathbb{O}_{2N}[N+f(N,1)]|\mathbb{O}_{2N}[f(N,1)]}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{2N}[N+f(1,1)]|\mathbb{O}_{2N}[f(1,1)]}\\
=&\sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_N,i'_1,\cdots,i'_N,o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N} p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_N,i'_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)\\
&\quad\mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|i'_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{o'_1|i'_1},
\end{aligned}
\tag{81}
$$

where we used Eqs. (79) and (80) in the first equality, Eqs. (76) and (77) in the second equality, and Eq. (74) in the fourth equality. Note that in the first line of Eq. (81), classical input $\mathbb{J}_k$ of a local operation only depends on classical output $\mathbb{O}_{k-1}$ of the previous local operation in $Q(\mathbb{J}_k|\mathbb{O}_{k-1})$.

Part B

In this part, we define new local operations performed in Alice's and Bob's laboratories denoted by $\mathcal{C}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}$ and $\mathcal{D}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)-1}}$, respectively, and show that the first line of Eq. (81) can be transformed to the standard form of LOCC using these local operations. We define $\mathcal{C}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}$ and $\mathcal{D}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)-1}}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}&:=\sum_{\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}} Q(\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1})\mathcal{C}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,0)}},\\
\mathcal{D}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)-1}}&:=\sum_{\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}} Q(\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)-1})\mathcal{C}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{J}_{f(k,1)}},
\end{aligned}
\tag{82}
$$

where we have used $Q(\mathbb{J}_1|\mathbb{O}_0):=Q(\mathbb{J}_1)$. By means of Eqs. (76) and (77), we obtain a relation

$$
\sum_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}}\mathcal{C}'^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}=\sum_{I_{f(k,0)},O_{f(k,0)}}\frac{q\left(I_1,\cdots,I_{f(k,0)}|O_1,\cdots,O_{f(k,0)-1}\right)}{q\left(I_1,\cdots,I_{f(k,0)-1}|O_1,\cdots,O_{f(k,0)-2}\right)}\mathcal{A}^{(k)}_{O_{f(k,0)}|\left(I_{f(k,0)}\right)},
\tag{83}
$$

where $I_{f(N,0)}$ and $O_{f(N,0)}$ are the $f(N,0)$-th and $2f(N,0)$-th entries of $\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)}$, respectively, and $\{I_l\}_{l=1}^{f(k,0)-1}$ and $\{O_l\}_{l=1}^{f(k,0)-1}$ are given by $\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}=\left(I_1,\cdots,I_{f(k,0)-1}|O_1,\cdots,O_{f(k,0)-1}\right)$. Eq. (75) represents the property of

$q(I_1,\cdots,I_{2N}|O_1,\cdots,O_{2N})$ satisfying causal order and Eq. (83) guarantees that $\{{\mathcal{C}'}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}\}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}}$ is indeed a quantum instrument for all k. Similarly, $\{{\mathcal{D}'}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)-1}}\}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}}$ is also shown to be a quantum instrument for all k.

Now the deterministic joint quantum operation given in the form of Eq. (4) can be represented in terms of quantum instruments $\{{\mathcal{C}'}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}\}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}}$ and $\{{\mathcal{D}'}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)-1}}\}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,1)}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_N,i'_1,\cdots,i'_N,o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N} p\left(i_1,\cdots,i_N,i'_1,\cdots,i'_N|o_1,\cdots,o_N,o'_1,\cdots,o'_N\right)\\
&\qquad \mathcal{A}^{(N)}_{o_N|i_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{o_1|i_1}\otimes\mathcal{B}^{(N)}_{o'_N|i'_N}\circ\cdots\circ\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_{o'_1|i'_1},\\
=&\sum_{\mathbb{O}_1,\cdots,\mathbb{O}_{2N}} {\mathcal{C}'}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(N,0)-1}}\circ\cdots\circ{\mathcal{C}'}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(1,0)-1}}\otimes{\mathcal{D}'}^{(N)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(N,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(N,1)-1}}\circ\cdots\circ{\mathcal{D}'}^{(1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(1,1)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(1,1)-1}}. \qquad (84)
\end{aligned}$$

by using Eq. (82). The right hand side of Eq. (84) is almost in the standard form of LOCC. The only case of Eq. (84) not fitting in LOCC is that where Alice (Bob) performs two local operations successively. This case is absorbed in LOCC in the following manner. Suppose Alice successively performs two local operations ${\mathcal{C}'}^{(k-1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k-1,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k-1,0)-1}}$ and ${\mathcal{C}'}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}$ where $f(k,0)=f(k-1,0)+1$. Since

$$\left\{\sum_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k-1,0)}} {\mathcal{C}'}^{(k)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)-1}}\circ{\mathcal{C}'}^{(k-1)}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k-1,0)}|\mathbb{O}_{f(k-1,0)-1}}\right\}_{\mathbb{O}_{f(k,0)}}$$

is a quantum instrument representing a local operation performed in Alice's laboratory, we regard these successive local operations as a single local operation performed in Alice's laboratory. Similarly, we combine successive local operations performed in Bob's laboratory into a single local operation. By repeating this procedure, we can rewrite Eq. (84) in the standard form of LOCC, where a sequence of local operations is performed alternatively in Alice's and Bob's laboratories. Hence, we can conclude that Eq. (84) reduces to a standard decomposition of LOCC given in the form of Eq. (2). Therefore, the "*if*" part of the proposition is proven.

[1] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox, Physics 1, 195 (1964); J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 880 (1969).
[2] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Quantum nonlocality as an axiom, Foundations of Physics vol. 24, 3, 379-385 (1994).
[3] C. H. Benett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wooters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
[4] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Quantifying entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2275, (1997).
[5] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, An introduction to entanglement measures, Quant. Inf. Comp. vol. 7, 1-51, (2007).
[6] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Limits for entanglement measures, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2014, (2000).
[7] E. Chitambar, D. Leung, L. Mancinska, M. Ozols, and A. Winter, Everything you always wanted to know about LOCC (but were afraid to ask), Commun. Math. Phys., vol. 328, no. 1, pp. 303-326 (2014).
[8] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa, and C. Brukner, Quantum correlations with no causal order, Nature communications 3, 1092 (2012).
[9] G. Chiribella, Theoretical framework for quantum networks, Phys. Rev. A 80, 022339 (2009).
[10] G. Chiribella, Quantum computations without definite causal structure, Phys. Rev. A 88, 022318 (2012).
[11] L. Hardy, Probability theories with dynamic causal structure: A New Framework for Quantum Gravity, arXiv:gr-qc/0509120 (2005).
[12] E.M. Rains, Phys. Rev. A 60, 173 (1999); 60, 179 (1999).
[13] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin and W. K. Wootters, Quantum nonlocality without entanglement, Phys. Rev. A 59, 1070-1091 (1999).
[14] J. Niset and N. J. Cerf, Multipartite nonlocality without entanglement in many dimensions, Phys. Rev. A 74, 52103 (2006).
[15] D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Unextendible product bases, uncompletable product bases and bound entanglement, Comm. Math. Phys. 238 (2003).
[16] E. Chitambar and R. Duan, Nonlocal entanglement transformations achievable by separable operations, Phy. Rev. Lett. 103, 110502 (2009).
[17] C. H. Bennett. talk at QUPON, Vienna, Austria, May (2005).
[18] S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, R. Garcia-Patron, V. Giovannetti, and Y. Shikano, Quantum mechanics of time travel through post-selected teleportation, Phys. Rev. D 84, 025007 (2011).
[19] S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, R. Garcia-Patron, V. Giovannetti, Y. Shikano, S. Pirandola, L. A. Rozema, A. Darabi, Y. Soudagar, L. K. Shalm, and A. M. Steinberg, Closed timelike curves via postselection: theory and experimental test of consistency, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 040403 (2011).
[20] T. Colnaghi, G. M. D'Ariano, S. Facchini, and P. Perinotti, Quantum computation with programmable connections between gates, Phys. Lett. A vol. 376 45 (2012).
[21] K. Nakago, M. Hajdusek, S. Nakayama and M. Murao, Parallelizable adiabatic gate teleportation, Phys. Rev. A 92, 062315 (2015).
[22] L. M. Procopio, A. Moqanaki, M. Araujo, F. Costa, I. A. Calafell, E. G. Dowd, D. R. Hamel, L. A. Rozema, C. Brukner, and P. Walther, Experimental superposition of orders of quantum gates, Nature Communications 6, Article number: 7913 (2015).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by the Project for Developing Innovation Systems of MEXT, Japan and JSPS by KAKENHI (Grant No. 23540463, 2633006,15H01677). We also gratefully acknowledge the ELC project (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas MEXT KAKENHI (Grant No. 24106009)) for encouraging this research.